

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are all the claims pending in the application. Applicants thank the Examiner and his Supervisor for meeting with Applicants' representative on March 10, 2004 to discuss the November 18, 2004 Office Action and Applicants' February 18, 2004 Response.

During this Interview, as documented by the Interview Summary prepared by the Examiner, the Examiner indicated that the present application appears to disclose patentable subject matter. Still, the Examiner thought that the instant claim language did not reflect the "patentable elements."

For the reasons provided in the February 18, 2004 Response, as well as those discussed during the March 10, 2004 Interview, Applicants respectfully disagree with this position by the Examiner. Nonetheless, solely to advance prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 1 to present the claim in a form to provide more detail as to patentable elements of the invention based on the Examiner's kind discussion of what he thought was missing from the claim. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in form for allowance, and request that the application be passed to issue as soon as possible.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Supplemental Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
Application No. 09/785,981

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Ronald Kimble Reg# 44, 186 for

Alan J. Kasper
Registration No. 25,426

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860
WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: March 18, 2004



PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of

Docket No: Q63222

Kazuhiro KUSUDA

Appln. No.: 09/785,981

Group Art Unit: 3713

Confirmation No.: 1740

Examiner: ENATSKY, Aaron L.

Filed: February 20, 2001

For: ONLINE GAME METHOD AND GAME SYSTEM

STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Please review and enter the following remarks summarizing the interview conducted on
March 10, 2004:

RECEIVED
MAR 23 2004
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 15100

REMARKS

An Examiner's Interview Summary Record (PTO-413) was provided to Applicants' representative at the interview.

During the interview, the following was discussed:

1. Identification of art discussed: U.S. Patent No. 4,572,509 to Sitrick and U.S. Patent No. 5,411,258 to Wilson et al.

2. Results of Interview:

Applicants' representative met with Examiner Enatsky and his supervisor, Examiner O'Neill. During the interview, Applicants' representative asserted that the invention is patentable because the prior art does not teach the essential features of having a game program simultaneously executed at each of plural terminals, including the generation of betting odds locally. Applicants' representative further asserted that the transmission of program execution

states and betting odds by each terminal to a central control unit and the integration of all of the execution states and betting odds at the central control unit for retransmission to the terminals for updating and display, was not taught in the prior art.

It was emphasized that Sitrick is 20 year old technology and that its disclosure is broad and general, and subject to various interpretations, such as simply having terminals forward input data to a central processor for running the game. In addition, Applicants' representative asserted that even in the distributed mode, the terminals may assist in processing of a single game program, as in a parallel processing operation, but that independent processing of a game at each terminal is not taught, especially with forwarding of execution states for integration by a central unit. Applicants' representative also argued that Wilson is not combinable with Sitrick, and in any event, does not remedy the deficiencies of Sitrick.

As documented in the Examiner Interview Summary, the Examiner indicated that it appeared that patentable subject matter is disclosed in the present application, but did not think that it was claimed in sufficient detail. Applicants respectfully disagree that the patentable subject matter of the invention is not sufficiently recited in the claims.

Statement of Substance of Interview
Application No. 09/785,981

It is believed that no petition or fee is required. However, if the USPTO deems otherwise, Applicant hereby petitions for any extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee, except for the Issue Fee, for such extension is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-4880.

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: March 18, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

Ronald Kimb
Alan J. Kasper

Registration No. 25,426

RS# 44,186
for